

APPLICANT(S): ORR, Michael et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/788,545
FILED: February 21, 2001
Page 8

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-21 and 33 are pending in the application. Claims 1-21 and 33 have been rejected. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9-11, 13-17, 19-20 and 33 have been amended.

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims add no new matter.

The Telephone Interview

Initially, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner, REFAL Ramsey, for granting and attending the telephone interview, with Applicants' Representative, Robert Schaffer, Reg. No. 33,775, Yosi Barkai and Tami Ben Ari on June 5, 2006. During the interview Applicants' representatives proposed amendments to the claims which are generally reflected in the amendments above. The Examiner indicated that such amendments may overcome the outstanding prior art rejection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9, 10 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, because "*partial response to a client before a full response from said server has been received*" and "*the client agent transmits partial response to a client*" are allegedly not described in the specification.

Applicants respectfully direct the attention of the examiner to elements 551 to 554 in Fig. 5 and the respective portions in the written description, paragraphs 0034 and 0035, which represent *fake response to a client before a full response from said server has been received*. Accordingly, Applicants assert that the recited features have sufficient support in the specification.

APPLICANT(S): ORR, Michael et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/788,545
FILED: February 21, 2001
Page 9

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-21 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Specifically, the Examiner has rejected claim 9 as reciting “the response” has insufficient antecedent basis. It is believed that this rejection was aimed to claim 9 erroneously and should have been aimed to claim 10. Claim 10 was amended accordingly.

Claims 1, 2, 4-5, 10-11, 13-17, 20 and 33 have been amended to overcome the antecedent basis deficiencies noted by the Examiner. Claims 3, 5-8, 9, 12, 13, 18, 19 and 21 depend on the above rejected claims, therefore are likewise allowable.

Applicants respectfully assert that these amendments render claims 2-21 and 33 proper under 35 USC 112 and request that the rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-21 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by the ‘780 patent to Kasriel et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.


Claims 1 and 11 were amended in line with the general observations discussed in the telephone interview. Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in paragraph 0034 reciting “The server's response 530 to the request is intercepted by the Client Agent 100 and stripped of all information other than page formatting and the list of objects needed to be retrieved in order to complete the page, with a command to re-load all the objects after they are all retrieved, by using for example a Java Script”, and in paragraph 0036: “This mode of the invention may be practiced utilizing only a Predictive Server 200 instead of a Client Agent 100”. Accordingly, Applicants assert that claims 1 and 11, as amended, have sufficient support in the specification and that the ‘780 patent does not disclose the “...one or more predictive requests for one or more objects, wherein the one or more objects are needed in order to complete the requested web page...”. In view of the above arguments, Applicants assert that independent claims 1 and 11 and the claims dependant therefrom, as amended, are deemed allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to the pending claims. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

APPLICANT(S): ORR, Michael et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/788,545
FILED: February 21, 2001
Page 10

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to discuss any still outstanding matters.

Please charge or credit any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,



Guy Yonay
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 52,388

Dated: June 8, 2006

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP
1500 Broadway, 12th Floor
New York, New York 10036
Tel: (646) 878-0800
Fax: (646) 878-0801